

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-25 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 8 have been amended and new claims 24 and 25 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 11-17, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by the Murayama publication. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The Murayama publication shows a supplemental bulkhead 15a coupled to a bulkhead 7. In Figure 40, the supplement bulkhead is shown as projecting from the bulkhead at a location other than an end of the bulkhead. In Figures 48 and 49, the supplement bulkhead 15a is shown projecting from an end the bulkhead.

The Murayama publication further discloses that supplement bulkheads 15a that project from adjacent bulkheads may be coupled together. The only drawings that show this connection are Figures 48 and 49. In these figures, the connected supplement bulkeads are located at the ends of the adjacent bulkheads. None of the drawings of the Murayama publication show a connection of supplement bulkheads that are coupled to locations other than the ends of the adjacent bulkheads as required by claim 1.

Notwithstanding these differences, the Examiner relied on Paragraphs 22 and 23 of the English translation of the Murayama publication to show a connection of supplement bulkheads that project from areas other than ends of adjacent bulkheads. However, Applicants submit Paragraphs 22 and 23 do not disclose these features.

Paragraph 22 discloses various arrangements where supplement bulkhead 15a projects from areas other than an end of a bulkhead. (See Figures 41-47). However, Paragraph 22 does not disclose that the supplement bulkheads shown in Figures 41-47 may be connected to another supplement bulkhead that projects from an adjacent bulkhead at a location other than an end of that adjacent bulkhead as required by claim 1.

Paragraph 23 discloses: “as shown in drawing 48, the adjoining septum edge 15 can also be set to combined septum edge 15a which was unified.” In Figure 48, both the adjoining septum edge 15 and the combined septum edge 15a are located at the ends of adjacent bulkheads. Neither Paragraph 23, Figures 48 and 49, or any other portion of the Murayama publication discloses connecting supplement bulkheads that respectively project from adjacent bulkheads, where the supplement bulkheads project from their respective bulkheads at locations other than ends of the bulkheads.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite these differences. As amended, claim 1 recites that “the supplement bulkhead is coupled at one side to a lateral face of the bulkhead at a location other than said end portion of the bulkhead and is connected at another side with another supplement bulkhead, that is coupled to a lateral face of an adjacent bulkhead.” (Emphasis added). Here, the term “lateral face” is added to clarify that each supplement bulkhead is coupled to a respective one of the bulkheads at a location different from its end. Neither Figures 48 and 49, nor Paragraphs 22 and 23, nor any other portion of the Murayama publication discloses these features.

Further, claim 1 recites that “the connection between the supplement bulkhead and said another supplement bulkhead separating the sealant from permeating into the emitting cell.” These features are also not disclosed by the Murayama publication.

Because the Murayama publication does not disclose all the features in claim 1, Applicants submit that the Murayama publication does not anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Murayama publication.

Claim 20 recites that a supplemental bulkhead which is angled between the emitting cell and the sealant “to prevent a sealant from permeating into the emitting cell.” The Murayama publication does not disclose these features, nor are they inherent to the Murayama structure. In order to establish that a claimed feature is inherent to the reference in an anticipatory rejection, it must be shown that the feature necessarily must exist in that reference. In Murayama, it is possible for the supplement bulkhead 15a to be coupled to a bulkhead and still not prevent a sealant from permitting into an emitting cell. Thus, the above-quoted features from claim 20 are not inherent to Murayama. Claim 21 recites similar features and therefore is allowable for similar reasons.

Moreover, new claims 24 and 25 have been added to further define the invention of claim 20. Claim 24 recites a first bulkhead and that “the supplemental bulkhead is coupled to the first bulkhead at an angle substantially different from a 90° angle and at a location different from

Amendment dated January 18, 2008

Reply to Office Action of November 20, 2007

an end of the first bulkhead.” These features are not disclosed by the Murayama publication when taken as a whole with the features in base claim 20.

Claim 25 recites that “the supplemental bulkhead is coupled to another supplemental bulkhead, said another supplemental bulkhead coupled to a second bulkhead adjacent the first bulkhead at a location different from an end of the second bulkhead.” These features are not disclosed by the Murayama publication when taken as a whole with the features in base claim 20.

Claims 5, 7-10, 18, 19, and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of an AAPA-Murayama combination. Applicants transverse this rejection on grounds that AAPA does not teach or suggest the features added by amendment to base claims 1 and 11 missing from the Murayama publication.

Additionally, claims 7 and 18 recite that the supplemental bulkhead coupled to at least one side portion other than said end portion of the bulkhead is connected with another supplemental bulkhead coupled to an adjacent bulkhead. These features are not taught or suggested by AAPA or Murayama, whether taken alone or in combination. Withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 10/824,364


Docket No. K-0633

Amendment dated January 18, 2008

Reply to Office Action of November 20, 2007

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3777  
**Date:** January 18, 2008

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**